

REMARKS

With the foregoing amendment claims 1-4 and 6-20 are pending in the application. Claim 5 is cancelled. Claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-17 are amended. And claim 20 is added. Claims 1, 8 and 16 are independent. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 1, 5-7, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Brill (US 6,816,184). Claims 2-4, 8-15, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Brill in view of Budge (US 6,359,560). Applicants respectfully traverse.

With respect to claim 1, claim 1 is patentable over Brill because Brill does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. For example, at the least, Brill does not disclose “an image capturing device, comprising a lens ... positioned in a room having a door; [and] a processor for determining whether said door has been opened,” as is recited in claim 1.

Brill discloses a system and method for mapping a location from a video image to a map. Brill further discloses placing an image capturing system in a room having a door (see FIG. 4). The image capturing system includes a lens and a processor. However, Brill does not disclose, teach or suggest that the processor is configured to determine whether the door has been opened. Accordingly, Brill does not disclose all of the features of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over Brill.

Furthermore, Budge does not make up for the deficient teaching of Brill. That is, like Brill, Budge does not disclose an image capturing device having a processor for determining whether a door has been opened, as is required by claim 1. Budge discloses a video surveillance system. The video surveillance system includes an image capturing device having a processor. However, Budge does not disclose, teach or suggest that the processor is or can be configured to determine whether a door has been opened.

Accordingly, neither Brill nor Budge, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is patentable over these two references. Similarly, claims 2-7, which depend from claim 1, are patentable over Brill and Budge.

With respect to claim 8, claim 8 is patentable over Brill in view of Budge because neither Brill nor Budge, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claim 8. For example, at the least, neither Brill nor Budge, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest “an event monitoring method, comprising ... storing information that maps a predefined object to a sink use event ...,” as is recited in claim 8. Hence, claim 8 is patentable over these two references. Similarly, claims 8-15, which depend from claim 8, are patentable over Brill and Budge.

With respect to claim 16, claim 16 is patentable over Brill in view of Budge because neither Brill nor Budge, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claim 16. For example, at the least, neither Brill nor Budge, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest “an event monitoring method, comprising ... identifying an event by comparing said object with a stored plurality of predefined objects, wherein said stored plurality of predefined objects includes an object that represents a door open event or a sink use event,” as is recited in claim 16.

Brill discloses an event monitoring method. For example, the system in Brill can determine whether an object has been left on table. However, Brill does not disclose, teach or suggest storing a plurality of predefined object including an object that represents a door open event or a sink use event. Budge does not make up for the deficient teachings of Brill. That is, like Brill, Budge does not disclose, teach or suggest storing a plurality of predefined object including an object that represents a door open event or a sink use event. Accordingly, neither Brill nor Budge, considered alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the features of claim 16. Hence, claim 16 is patentable over these two references. Similarly, claims 17-20, which depend from claim 16, are patentable over Brill and Budge.


New Claims

New claim 20 is sought to be added. Claim 20 depends from claim 16 and is therefore patentable for at least reason give above with respect to claim 16.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections, and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

| RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED, | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|
| <i>NAME AND REG. NUMBER</i> | Brian Rosenbloom, Registration No.: 41,276 | | | | |
| <i>SIGNATURE</i> |  | | | <i>DATE</i> | 3/25/08 |
| <i>Address</i> | Rothwell, Figg, Ernst & Manbeck Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W. | | | | |
| <i>City</i> | Washington | <i>State</i> | D.C. | <i>Zip Code</i> | 20005 |
| <i>Country</i> | U.S.A. | <i>Telephone</i> | 202-783-6040 | <i>Fax</i> | 202-783-6031 |

S:\DATA\Clients\2873\034\10015531-1 (2873-034)-Reply to first Office Action.doc